



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,572	11/11/2003	Michael Donovan Mitchell	8681RCR	4234
27752	7590	06/14/2005	EXAMINER	
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161 6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE CINCINNATI, OH 45224			KIM, YOON YOUNG	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1723		
DATE MAILED: 06/14/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/705,572	MITCHELL ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Yoon-Young Kim	1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
**THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Terminal Disclaimer***

1. The terminal disclaimer filed on May 2, 2005 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of U.S. Patent No. 6,827,854 B2 and any patent granted on U.S. Patent Application No. 10/705,174 and 10/464,210 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 5 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy in view of Derbyshire et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,057,262 and Tremblay et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,660,166 B2.

Regarding Claim 1, Levy discloses a kit comprising: a filter for providing potable water, comprising: a housing (Fig. 1, #11) having an inlet (#32) and an outlet (#33); and a filter material disposed within the housing formed at least in part from a plurality of activated carbon filter particles (Col. 11, Lines 53-58). Levy does not disclose mesoporous activated carbon. Derbyshire teaches mesoporous activated carbon particles (Col. 4, Lines 20-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Levy with the element of Derbyshire because it is an activated carbon used in waste water treatment (Col. 1, Lines 18-23). Levy

Art Unit: 1723

does not disclose a package or a method of communicating information. Tremblay teaches a package for containing the filter; and wherein either the package or the filter housing comprises information that the filter or filter material provides reduction of water contaminants (Col. 5, Line 54 – Col. 6, Line 4). It would have also been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Levy by adding the elements of Tremblay in order to convey the important benefits of the filter (Col. 5, Lines 63-67).

Regarding Claim 2, Derbyshire discloses the that the sum of the mesopore and the macropore volumes of the plurality of mesoporous activated carbon filter particles is between about 0.2 mL/g and about 2 mL/g (Col. 4, Lines 23-30).

Regarding Claim 5, Levy in view of Derbyshire and Tremblay does not disclose the single-collector efficiency or the filter coefficient. Optimum or workable ranges of result-effective variables would be determined to achieve the desired results in the process. In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). The filter characteristics used to calculate the single-collector efficiency or the filter coefficient are result-effective variables, and their optimum ranges would have been determined by routine experimentation in order to achieve the desired results in filtration.

Regarding Claims 14-15, Levy does not disclose a package or a method of communicating information. Tremblay teaches a package for containing the filter; and wherein either the package or the filter housing comprises information that the filter or filter material provides reduction of water contaminants (Col. 5, Line 54 – Col. 6, Line 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Levy by adding the elements of Tremblay in order to convey the important benefits of the filter (Col. 5, Lines 63-67).

Art Unit: 1723

4. Claims 7-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauman et al, U.S. Patent No. 4,396,512 in view of Derbyshire

Regarding Claim 7, Beauman discloses a filter for providing potable water, comprising: a housing having an inlet and an outlet (Col. 15, Lines 5-10); and a filter material disposed within the housing formed at least in part from a plurality of activated carbon filter particles and particles selected from the group consisting of activated carbon filter particles coated entirely with silver or a silver containing material, activated carbon filter particles partially coated with silver or a silver containing material, silver particles and mixtures thereof (Col. 14, Lines 10-24). Beauman does not disclose the pore size of the activated carbon filter particles. Derbyshire teaches activated carbon that is mesoporous (Col. 4, Lines 20-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Beauman by adding the pore size of Derbyshire because it is an activated carbon used in waste water treatment (Col. 1, Lines 18-23).

Regarding Claim 8, Derbyshire discloses the that the sum of the mesopore and the macropore volumes of the plurality of mesoporous activated carbon filter particles is between about 0.2 mL/g and about 2 mL/g (Col. 4, Lines 23-30).

Regarding Claim 9-10, Beauman discloses that the BRI, VRI, F-BLR, and F-VLR values are as claimed by the invention and in compliance with EPA regulations (Col. 3, Lines 8-14).

Regarding Claim 11, Beauman in view of Derbyshire does not disclose the single-collector efficiency or the filter coefficient. Optimum or workable ranges of result-effective variables would be determined to achieve the desired results in the process. In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). The filter characteristics used to calculate the single-collector efficiency or the filter coefficient are result-effective variables, and their optimum ranges would have been determined by routine experimentation in order to achieve the desired results in filtration.

Art Unit: 1723

Regarding Claim 13, Beauman discloses a filter for providing potable water, comprising: a housing having an inlet and an outlet (Col. 15, Lines 5-10); and a filter material disposed within the housing formed at least in part from a plurality of activated carbon filter particles and other materials selected from the group consisting of activated carbon powders, activated carbon granules, activated carbon fibers, zeolites, activated alumina, activated magnesia, diatomaceous earth, activated silica, hydrotalcites, glass, polyethylene fibers, polypropylene fibers, ethylene maleic anhydride copolymers fibers, sand, clay and mixtures thereof (Col. 4, Line 67 - Col. 5, Line 2), wherein at least a portion of the other materials are coated with silver or a silver containing material (Col. 14, Lines 10-24). Beauman does not disclose the pore size of the activated carbon filter particles. Derbyshire teaches activated carbon that is mesoporous (Col. 4, Lines 20-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Beauman by adding the pore size of Derbyshire because it is an activated carbon used in waste water treatment (Col. 1, Lines 18-23).

5. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy in view of Derbyshire and Tremblay as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Beauman.

Regarding Claim 3-4, Levy in view of Derbyshire and Tremblay does not disclose BRI, VRI, F-BLR, and F-VLR values. Beauman discloses that the BRI, VRI, F-BLR, and F-VLR values are as claimed by the invention and in compliance with EPA regulations (Col. 3, Lines 8-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Levy in view of Derbyshire and Tremblay by adding the BRI, VRI, F-BLR, and F-VLR values of Beauman in order to comply with EPA regulations.

Art Unit: 1723

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy in view of Derbyshire and Tremblay as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Denkewicz.

Regarding Claim 6, Levy in view of Derbyshire and Tremblay discloses that the plurality of mesoporous activated carbon filter particles are basic (Levy, Col. 35, Lines 11-16) but does not disclose a point zero charge or an ORP. Denkewicz teaches a point zero charge between about 9 and about 12 (Col. 1, Lines 45-51) and an ORP between about 290 mV and about 175 mV (Col. 1, Lines 23-27). Optimum or workable ranges of result-effective variables would be determined to achieve the desired results in the process. In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). The point zero charge and ORP are result-effective variables, and their optimum ranges would have been determined by routine experimentation in order to achieve the desired results in filtration.

7. Claim 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauman in view of Derbyshire as applied to Claim 7 above, and further in view of Levy and Denkewicz, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,772,896.

Regarding Claim 12, Beauman in view of Derbyshire does not disclose that the plurality of mesoporous activated carbon filter particles are basic or a point zero charge or an ORP. Levy teaches that the plurality of mesoporous activated carbon filter particles are basic (Col. 35, Lines 11-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Beauman in view of Derbyshire with the element of Levy because they are both water filters. Denkewicz teaches a point zero charge between about 9 and about 12 (Col. 1, Lines 45-51) and an ORP between about 290 mV and about 175 mV (Col. 1, Lines 23-27). Optimum or workable ranges of result-effective variables would be determined to achieve the desired results in the process. In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). The point zero charge and ORP are result-

Art Unit: 1723

effective variables, and their optimum ranges would have been determined by routine experimentation in order to achieve the desired results in filtration.

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments, see page 4, filed May, 2, 2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of Claim(s) 1-6 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Derbyshire et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,057,262. Derbyshire teaches the activated carbon particles of the invention.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yoon-Young Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-2240. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-4:30, Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda Walker can be reached on (571) 272-1151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
W. L. WALKER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700